

In Denial Of Female Evil

By VennerRoad, 4th Feb 2015

**Do women who kill deserve to be held accountable for their crimes?
Not according to some.**



Karla Homolka enjoying prison life.

As pointed out in an [earlier article](#), women are by and large a far more law-abiding bunch than men, and when it comes to violence, especially murder, they lag way behind. There are exceptions though; on occasion, the depths of depravity to which some women sink can compete with those of the most notorious crooks, sexual predators and serial killers. Alas, there are those, sadly, for whom female evil is a myth, if any woman commits an evil act or a succession of evil acts, her actions must ultimately be the fault of a man somewhere in her recent or distant past, however remote the connection and however depraved her behaviour may be.

This ludicrous narrative has been spun tirelessly, largely by radical feminists, but they are not the only ones for whom this is the only explanation for female evil. UK denizens, those with long memories, will recall the case of serial child killer Myra Hindley (the willing partner of Glaswegian psychopath Ian Brady) who was championed by the eccentric peer Lord Longford. Mostly though it is feminists of one sort or another for whom woman is the root of no evil, period.

Unless, dear reader, you have studied this subject in some depth, you will probably not understand the full ramifications of the foregoing statements. Your education begins here.

Prison is an undesirable institution, but until we can find some way to change human nature, it will remain an unfortunate necessity. The purpose of prison is usually seen as threefold: retribution, deterrence and rehabilitation. This is actually more generally the purpose of punishment, and need not include prison, it may occur within the home or a school setting, for example. Sometimes these three purposes are supplemented with restoration, and other concepts, but the bottom line is that people who are a danger to others or to society as a whole must be taken off the street, sometimes permanently. Those – the vast majority who are released back into society – must be deterred from engaging in this sort of behaviour in the future. And those who are likely to re-offend in spite of the punishment must be trained, incentivised, or otherwise reformed to make good citizens of them. It is easy to mock these professed goals, but there is absolutely nothing ignoble about them. Ask [Chris Grayling](#).

What though of women's prisons? Well, according to radical feminists, they are a form of violence against women! Take for example the Center For Women's Studies, [according to which](#) "90% of women in prison are survivors of abuse."

They make up these statistics as they go along, but the rhetoric is also deceitful, alluding to victims of domestic abuse as survivors, as though they were lucky to escape with their lives. A few are, but the overwhelming majority are not, and much domestic abuse – so-called – is two-way. In October 2014, the CUNY Graduate Center hosted a conference to discuss the incarceration of women and related issues. At this meeting it was deemed taboo to refer to prisoners as prisoners, rather they were to be called incarcerated persons. For real.

One of the panelists at this meeting was Amy Meacham, who was and is presented both as an activist for violence against women and as a victim of domestic violence. This is a curious claim to make for a woman of her appalling antecedents. In May 2006, she was given an eight year sentence for shooting her boyfriend as he held their four year old daughter.

She is said [to have declared](#) that "the only evidence connecting her to the crime is the false statement of the victim." This was another curious declaration, because she had pleaded guilty, but this appears to be because she was "confused when she pleaded guilty, as her counsel failed to inform her of her constitutional rights." Naturally that did not wash.

Another member of the panel was Sharon Richardson, whose crime was even worse than that of Meacham, not just because her victim died, but because it was premeditated, and she lured no fewer than five other people into doing the evil deed for her, thus ruining four other lives too, (one of them was never caught). Given a sentence of twenty years to life, she is, would you believe, a victim of domestic violence? Her crime was the result of battered woman syndrome, not that she admitted to ordering it, but if she had been responsible for the death of Jeffrey Bridges, it would have been because he deserved it for pushing her over the edge.

This sort of nonsense has become a staple of murder trials in which the victim is male and the accused is not. It may well have been that the relatively short relationship between Bridges and Richardson was abusive on his side, but she was not a vulnerable woman – so-called – nor was she of low intelligence or a sista from da hood, rather she was a prison officer working in a men’s prison which was where and when she met him. Bridges was a drug dealer who was being held on a weapons charge, yet she invited this man into her home, nay, she took him home, and according to her, he physically abused her two year old son and molested her eight year old daughter as well as beating her, although we have only her word for any of that.

If Richardson had both the nous and the stomach to arrange his murder, she could have arranged instead for him to be thrown out of her apartment, or simply given him his marching orders. If she could impose her will on five individuals to commit a murder for her, why could she not have imposed her will on one to persuade him to part company with her? Indeed, if Bridges had treated her offspring as she claimed, especially her daughter, she was duty bound not simply to throw him out but have him arrested. Instead, she had him [beaten to death](#), and she is the one who is portrayed as the victim of domestic abuse. It is incredible is it not that a woman of Richardson’s antecedents and a woman like Amy Meacham – who wilfully endangered the life of her own daughter – should be speaking against domestic violence, violence against *wimmin* and about how terrible a place is prison? So terrible in fact that it allowed Richardson to earn a degree in social sciences.

Similar nonsense has been peddled in the UK, and women have literally gotten away with murder on account of it. One of the most outrageous cases was that of Zoora Shah, who murdered her lover Mohammed Azam in April 1992.

Azam was no angel, to put it mildly, but he was in effect her guardian angel. In 1980, Shah was pregnant with her third child when her husband deserted her. Azam, a married man, set her up in a house, and she became his mistress, perhaps only by force of circumstance or out of desperation, but without him she would have been destitute.

The relationship soured, but it remains to be seen whose fault it was. In October 1984, Azam was given a ten year sentence for drug offences, and was released in 1989. While he was in prison, Shah tried to steal his house by forgery, then later she tried to hire or incite another man to murder him, and when he did not comply, she accused the same man of raping her. Then she laced Azam's food with arsenic, and finally poisoned him fatally at the second attempt. He died a horrible death. She was convicted of murder and given the mandatory life sentence, but her case was taken up by a gaggle of feminists, Southall Black Sisters, and somehow it was referred to the Court Of Appeal, at which point she had been transformed into a poor, illiterate, battered, Asian woman who had not only been raped multiple times by Azam but had become a mattress to half Bradford's Moslems, presumably the male half.

It remains to be seen how illiterate she actually was, certainly she knew how to spell arsenic, although not necessarily in English. The Court Of Appeal did not think much of the new evidence that was adduced (ie [manufactured](#)) by Southall Black Sisters, and Lord Justice Kennedy waxed lyrical [in dismissing her application](#):

“Here Mr Fitzgerald submits that the appellant put forward a defence which she now admits to have been a tissue of lies because she wished to protect herself and especially her family from further shame and the risk of violence...Up to a point that is evidence which we accept, but only up to a point because this appellant, as it seems to us, is an unusual woman. Her way of life had been such that there might not have been much left of her honour to salvage...The forgery executed to obtain title, and the false allegations of rape and theft made against Bala are but two examples of that. The nature of her defence at the trial which involved an open attack on Bala and others, and a thinly veiled suggestion that the deceased's own widow might have been responsible for his death is another example.”

In spite of her appeal being given short shrift, this cold-blooded murderess was paroled in 2006. Incredibly, one feminist academic, Ann Carline of Liverpool John Moores University, argued that it was not poor oppressed Zoora who was the villain of the piece, but Lord Justice Kennedy, whose use of the phrase “an unusual woman” consti-

tuted hate speech!

There have been other notorious cases in the UK in which women have gotten away with murder either on the basis of lies concocted after conviction or simply by portraying the victim as the perpetrator, perhaps most notably Sara Thornton. The same thing has happened in both the US and Canada, and undoubtedly in other jurisdictions.

One of the most notorious American cases in recent years is that of Jodi Arias, who murdered her lover Travis Alexander in quite brutal fashion. After luring him into the shower at his home on the pretext of a photo-shoot, she stabbed him some 27 times, slit his throat so badly that his head was nearly hacked off, and for good measure put a bullet in his brain.

When she was arrested, Arias protested her innocence, claiming she had not seen Travis for some time. Then she claimed to have been present while he was murdered by two other people. Finally, in the light of absolutely overwhelming evidence, she admitted she had killed him but claimed she did so in self-defence.

As she had sought him out after he broke off their relationship, and in view of the shocking overkill, one would have expected this to be an open and shut case of murder. Surely no one but the defendant and her lawyer (acting on instructions) could suggest she was a victim of abuse, and the only way out of their relationship was to kill Travis. Right? Wrong! Not one but two expert witnesses, so-called, testified for Arias: a so-called domestic violence expert, Alyce LaViolette, and psychologist Robert Geffner.

Based solely on her interviews with Arias – demonstrably one of the biggest liars who ever walked the Earth – LaViolette testified that she was the victim [rather than Travis](#). Geffner claimed Arias was suffering from post traumatic stress disorder as a result of the foul deed. Poor woman, and if she had broken a leg running from the crime scene, should we empathise with that too? Geffner was shredded by prosecutor Juan Martinez.

If feminists and their ilk can find no evil in a cold-blooded killer like

Jodi Arias, then surely they would not view a female serial killer as a victim, or a woman who knowingly married a serial rapist then assisted him to carry out more dastardly crimes, including the murders of two teenage girls? Sadly, if you thought that, you would be wrong.

The case of Aileen Wuornos was discussed here in [a previous article](#), but it is very well known. Wuornos murdered seven innocent men between November 1989 and November 1990. Her first victim was a man named Richard Mallory, who is said to have been a convicted rapist. According to daffy feminist Phyllis Chesler, Wuornos was a victim, the real villain of her story was Mallory, who pushed her over the edge by raping her. Incredibly, Chesler was given space to publish this garbage in a peer reviewed journal, a 1993 issue of *St John's Law Review*. Its title, [*A Woman's Right To Self-Defense*](#), tells us more about its author than about Aileen Wuornos.

The truth is that Richard Mallory had been convicted of attempted rape [in 1957](#), the year after Wuornos was born. Apart from that, he appears to have been obsessed with sex, but mere obsession is not a crime. A divorcee, he had associated with a number of women of what might be termed loose morals, he also had a girlfriend, and none of these or anyone else appears to have accused him of rape. Besides, Wuornos did not simply murder Richard Mallory, she robbed him.

As was made clear earlier, not all the men in her life had treated her unkindly, including her brother, from whom she inherited \$10,000, so this damsel of death had no real mitigation for any of her crimes.

Karla Homolka may not have murdered seven people, but she has the blood of at least three innocent girls on her hands, one of them her own sister. That is without the human suffering of many others at the hands of her serial rapist husband Paul Bernardo, whom she could have stopped; instead, she immersed herself in his depravity. Shocking though Homolka's tale may be, even more shocking was the response of the legal authorities, in particular Marion Boyd, then Attorney General of Ontario, who allowed Homolka to plead guilty to lesser offences in return for a mere 12 years behind bars; she viewed Homolka as a victim of domestic abuse, saying as much, and therefore (in her eyes) not culpable in the murders of two teenage girls, even though

there was no evidence that Bernardo was physically abusing her at the time the infamous couple killed Karla's sister Tammy (unintentionally) during the course of a drug-assisted rape.

This scandalous case is widely known and has been analysed by among others the Canadian anti-feminist activist Diana Davison, whose writings and videos can be found all over the Web. Be warned, Diana takes no prisoners, and her polemicising is not to everybody's taste, nevertheless she has done some incredible work exposing the perversion of the rule of law in especially Canada by feminist fanatics who are hellbent on placing women above the law, at least when it comes to murdering their spouses, lovers, and men in general. Her deconstruction of the *scholarship* [of Elizabeth Sheehy](#) is particularly impressive, although it is frightening to realise that such nonsense has become the perceived wisdom not only on both sides of the Atlantic in both academic and legal circles, but throughout the English-speaking world, including, increasingly, India.

Fortunately, most women have more in common with Diana Davison than with Marion Boyd; both Jodi Arias and before her acquitted murderess Casey Anthony became hate figures for many American women, while their supporters were mostly white males of a certain age who keep their brains inside their trousers.

Female evil may be a lot rarer than the male kind, but only a fool or a mischief-maker would attempt to deny it or explain it away. When women commit especially the ultimate crime, they must be held to account in exactly the same way as are men. That is what the rule of law is all about.

<https://www.infotextmanuscripts.org/wikinut/wikinut-in-denial-of-female-evil.html>